



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,736	06/28/2001	Steven G. Smith	BS00-106	3586

7590 03/17/2005
WITHERS & KEYS, LLC
P.O. BOX 71355
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,736

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's amendment and remarks received on 1.7.2005.

Claims 1-28 are presented for further examination.

Response to Arguments

2> Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23-28 have been considered but are not persuasive. Furthermore, the amendments, as written, do not overcome the prior art reference [Devine].

During the telephone interview on 12.22.2004, Applicant discussed with Examiner the merits of the present application that distinguished itself from the prior art. One of these merits was that the present invention allowed a user of its system to access a legacy system, an intranet or both; the prior art taught that the legacy system must be accessed through an intranet.

However, Applicant's amendments do not properly distinguish this feature; they merely state that the legacy system and the intranet are distinct from one another. The prior art clearly discloses this functionality, because user accesses the legacy systems through an intranet, these two components must be distinct from one another [Figure 5]. As can be seen in the figure, the intranet is clearly separate from the Intranet, thereby disclosing the amended limitation. Basically, simply because two systems are distinct from one another does not preclude the possibility that one system may be used to access another.

Therefore, the amendments do not overcome the Device reference and the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejections of claims 23-28 are maintained.

Art Unit: 2152

3> Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22, have been considered but are not persuasive. Furthermore, the amendments do not overcome the prior art reference [Willis].

Applicant argues that the Willis reference does not disclose providing access to an intranet that is distinct from legacy systems. A proper reading of the Willis reference reveals that he does disclose the amended limitation. Willis discloses a system for providing personnel access to remote systems, the remote systems including both legacy and non-legacy systems and the access including accepting both first and second requests for data stored in legacy and non-legacy systems, respectively [column 6 «lines 1-5» | claims 3 and 7]. Further, Willis discloses that an advantage of his system is that it can also allow technicians access to an intranet [column 14 «line 19»]. As can be seen in claims 3 and 7, Willis discloses that is both a legacy and non-legacy system (intranet). Therefore, a user is directed to one or the other when making data requests.

Willis discloses accessing remote systems, and specifically enabling a user to request data to both legacy and non-legacy systems [claims 3, 7]. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C § 102(e) and 103(a) rejections of claims 1- 22 are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4> The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2152

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5> Claims 1, 4, 6, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. et al, U.S Patent No. 6,738,815 ["Willis"].

6> As to claim 1, Willis discloses a system for permitting a user to access data on a legacy system and an intranet [abstract], comprising:

a systems interface coupled to the legacy system, wherein the systems interface comprises at least one network address that can be accessed by a computer over a communication network [column 3 <lines 25-33> | column 5 <lines 30-36>],

wherein the systems interface is adapted to direct communications from the computer from the at least one network address to a separate network address corresponding to the intranet that is distinct from the legacy system [Figure 3 | column 9 <lines 30-55> | column 10 <line 63> to column 11 <line 12> | column 11 <lines 60-67> | claims 3 and 7].

Art Unit: 2152

7> As to claim 4, Willis discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the systems interface comprises a first server for managing protocol regarding the computer and a second server for generating transactions regarding the legacy systems [column 3 <lines 25-33>].

8> As to claim 6, Willis discloses the system of claim 4, the second server sends a command to the first server to direct the computer to the separate network address in order to direct communications from the computer to the intranet [Figures <1, 3> | column 3 <28-33> | column 5 <lines 24-63> | column 11 <line 59> to column 12 <line 4> where: the TechNet server is equivalent in functionality to the second server, and the protocol server is equivalent to the first server].

9> As to claim 11, Willis discloses a system for permitting a user to access data [abstract], comprising:

a computer operable by the user to access information from a legacy system [column 3 <lines 6-12>]; and

means for providing an interface between the computer and the legacy system, the means having a first address [column 3 <lines 25-33> | column 5 <lines 30-36>],

wherein the means for providing an interface is adapted to direct communications from the computer from the first network address to a second network address providing access to an intranet that is distinct from the legacy system in response to a user input [Figure 3 | column 6 <lines 51-63> | column 9 <lines 30-55> | column 10 <line 63> to column 11 <line 12> | column 11 <lines 60-67> | claims 3 and 7].

10> As to claim 13, Willis' discloses the system of claim 11, wherein the means for providing an interface comprises at least one protocol server and at least one transaction server, wherein the at least one protocol server provides an interface between the computer and the at least one transaction server, and wherein the at least one transaction server receives requests and generates legacy system transactions [column 3 <lines 25-33> | column 5 <lines 30-36>].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12> Claims 2, 3, 7, 14, 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, in view of Stone et al, U.S Patent No. 6,101,510 ["Stone"].

13> As to claim 2, Willis discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the systems interface sends a command for the computer in order to direct communications from the computer to the intranet [column 6 <line 67> to column 7 <line 6>] but does not explicitly disclose that the command launches a browser.

Art Unit: 2152

14> Stone discloses a systems interface sending a command to launch a browser to direct communications from the computer to an intranet [column 1 <lines 8-11> | column 2 <lines 35-39> | column 3 <lines 1-9> | column 12 <lines 60-65>] where: the server applications is comparable to a systems interface, and sends a command to the user computer to launch a browser] to allow applications to automatically direct the browser to an internet or intranet site without any interaction from the user. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Stone's web browser control functionality into Willis' systems interface to automatically direct client computers to the proper internet or intranet site without any user interaction.

15> As to claim 3, Willis' discloses the system of claim 2, wherein commands comprise an application program interface command [column 6 <line 67> to column 7 <line 6>] but does not explicitly disclose that the command is for launching a browser.

16> Stone discloses an application program interface command for launching a browser [column 3 <lines 1-12>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement one of Willis' application program interfaces as Stone's browser launching API command to automatically open and direct the browser to the appropriate intranet site.

17> As to claim 7, Willis' discloses the system of claim 4, wherein the systems interface sends at least one command for the first server to direct the computer to the separate network address in order to direct communications from the computer to the intranet [Figures <1, 3> |

Art Unit: 2152

column 3 <28-33> | column 5 <lines 24-63> | column 11 <line 59> to column 12 <line 4> where: the TechNet server is equivalent in functionality to the second server, and the protocol server is equivalent to the first server], but does not specifically disclose a command for the computer to launch a browser.

18> Stone discloses a systems interface sending a command to launch a browser to direct communications from the computer to an a separate network address [column 1 <lines 8-11> | column 2 <lines 35-39> | column 3 <lines 1-9 and lines 34-37>] to allow applications to automatically direct the browser to an internet or intranet site without any interaction from the user. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Stone's web browser control functionality into Willis' systems interface to automatically direct client computers to the proper internet or intranet site without any user interaction.

19> As to claim 14, Willis' discloses the system of claim 13, wherein the means for providing an interface issues at least one command that causes the computer to launch a browser and that causes the at least one protocol server to direct the computer from the first network address to the second network address [Figures <1, 3> | column 3 <28-33> | column 5 <lines 24-63> | column 11 <line 59> to column 12 <line 4>], but does not specifically disclose a command for the computer to launch a browser.

20> Stone discloses a systems interface sending a command to launch a browser that causes a server to direct a computer [column 1 <lines 8-11> | column 2 <lines 35-39> | column 3 <lines 1-9 and lines 34-37>] to allow applications to automatically direct the browser to an internet or intranet site without any interaction from the user. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Stone's web browser control functionality into Willis' systems interface to automatically direct client computers to the proper internet or intranet site without any user interaction.

21> As to claim 15, Willis discloses a method for accessing data, comprising:
logging a computer onto a systems interface that permits remote access of legacy systems [abstract | column 3 <lines 14-24>];
accessing the systems interface at a first network address [column 9 <lines 46-55>];
providing a user input for accessing an intranet that is distinct from the legacy systems [column 5 <lines 64-67> | column 6 <lines 51-63>];
accessing an intranet separately from the legacy systems at a separate network address [column 11 <line 60> to column 12 <line 4> | column 14 <line 19 where: the TechNet server and legacy system are located on an intranet].

Willis does not explicitly disclose launching a browser in response to a command from the systems interface.

22> Stone teaches a systems interface sending a command to launch a browser [column 1 <lines 8-11> | column 2 <lines 35-39> | column 3 <lines 1-9 and lines 34-37>] to allow applications

to automatically direct the browser to an internet or intranet site without any interaction from the user. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Stone's web browser control functionality into Willis' systems interface to automatically direct client computers to the proper internet or intranet site without any user interaction.

23> As to claim 16, Willis discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the systems interface comprises a first server and a second server, wherein the first server provides an interface between the computer and the second server, wherein the first server has the first network address, wherein the second server is adapted to receive requests and generate legacy transactions, and wherein the second server has a second network address [Figures <3,5,6> | column 3 <lines 25-33> | column 9 <lines 46-65> | column 11 <lines 60-67>].

24> As to claim 17, Willis discloses the method of claim 16, wherein the computer is logged onto the first server [Figure 6 | column 8 <lines 64-66>].

25> As to claim 19, Willis discloses the method of claim 16, wherein the command comprises an application program interface command issued by the first server or the second server [column 6 <line 64> to column 7 <line 14> | column 7 <lines 53-64>].

26> Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Willis, in view of Butts et al, U.S Patent No. 6,233,541 ["Butts"].

27> As to claim 5, Willis discloses the system of claim 4, wherein the at least one network address comprises a first IP address corresponding to the first server and a second IP address corresponding to the second server [Figure 20 | column 9 <lines 51-53> | column 10 <lines 5-7> | column 11 <line 60> to column 12 <line 10> | column 12 <lines 46-67> where: although, Willis does not specifically state that the second server has an IP address, a server having an IP address is well known in the art, and he does state that the second server has a separate address from the first server].

Willis discloses a legacy system and intranet with a separate address but does not explicitly disclose that separate network address comprises a third IP address.

28> Butts teaches that a legacy system with an IP address [abstract | Figure 1 where: the legacy system is accessed using TCP/IP communications]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have implemented Willis' separate address as an IP address to allow Willis' clients access to the legacy system and intranet across a persistent TCP/IP connection, thereby permitting real-time bi-directional communication with the system.

29> Claims 8, 9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, in view of Devine.

30> As to claim 8, Willis discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the computer is running application-specific client software to enable the computer to access the information from the

legacy system [column 6 <lines 51-63>], but does not explicitly disclose that enabling the computer access to the legacy information comprising causing a browser to be launched at the computer to direct communications from the computer to the intranet, and wherein the browser is displayed at the computer as an active window with the application-specific client software being minimized or hidden behind the active window.

31> Devine discloses a system running application-specific client software comprising a causing a browser to be launched at the computer to direct communications from the computer to the intranet [column 12 <lines 28-31> | column 13 <lines 62-67>], and wherein the browser is displayed at the computer as an active window with the application-specific client software being minimized or hidden behind the active window [Figure 2 <items 12, 14> | column 7 <lines 1-20> where: the backplane is comparable to the application-specific client software]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate all of Devine's browser and application-specific software functionality into Willis' system and software to allow the client to utilize their own browser to connect to an intranet, thereby limiting the need for training and support as the client already is familiar with his browser [Devine – column 2 <lines 11-26>].

32> As to claim 9, Willis discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the computer is logged onto the systems interface using the application-specific client software, and wherein, following the directing, the computer remains logged onto the systems interface and the application-specific client software remains an active application [column 6 <lines 51-63> |

column 7 <lines 6-13> where: the GUI layer is comparable to application-specific client software].

33> As to claim 12, Willis does disclose user input [column 6 <lines 51-63>] but does not explicitly state that said input comprises engagement of a software key by the user.

34> Devine discloses user input as engagement of a software key by the user [column 7 <lines 64-67>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to infer that Willis' GUI layer would have had icons or keys available for engagement to the user to allow the user to access the various functionality of the GUI, as taught by Devine.

35> Claims 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis and Stone, in further view of Devine et al, U.S Patent No. 6,598,167 ["Devine"].

36> As to claim 18, Willis does disclose a method of claim 16, a user input [column 6 <lines 51-63>] but does not explicitly state that said input comprises engagement of a software key by the user.

37> Devine discloses user input as engagement of a software key by the user [column 7 <lines 64-67>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to infer that Willis' GUI layer would have had icons or keys available for engagement to the user to allow the user to access the various functionality of the GUI, as taught by Devine.

38> As to claim 20, Willis discloses displaying a technician interface [column 3 <lines 64-65> | column 6 <lines 52-63>] but does not specifically state displaying a technician home page corresponding to the separate network address.

39> Devine teaches displaying a technician home page corresponding to the separate network address [Figure 3 | column 7 <lines 21-34> | column 8 <lines 17-30>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Devine's home page functionality into Willis' technician interface to obtain the advantage of establishing secure TCP messaging sessions by utilizing a browser to access data.

40> As to claim 21, Willis discloses the method of claim 20, further comprising the step of retrieving local information from the intranet, the local information comprising one or more of: cross-box locations, pricing information, service information cable records, and plat records [column 1 <lines 32-53> | column 3 <lines 34-41>].

41> As to claim 22, Willis discloses the method of claim 21, further comprising the step of returning to the systems interface [Figure 1 | column 5 <lines 24-36>].

42> Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Stone.

Art Unit: 2152

43> As to claim 23, Devine discloses a method for permitting a user to access data [column 2 <lines 55-60>], comprising:

authenticating a computer attempting to log onto a systems interface to legacy systems [column 8 <lines 31-34>];

providing access to the systems interface, the systems interface corresponding to at least one network address [Figure 1 <items 17,24> | column 13 <lines 29-35> | column 13 <line 62> to column 14 <line 7> where: Devine's DMZ is comparable to the systems interface];

receiving and processing at the systems interface a request for access to an intranet that is distinct from the legacy systems [Figure 1 <items 14,30> | column 12 <lines 28-32 and lines 35-37> | column 13 <lines 62-63> where: the server attempts to authenticate the client]; and

directing communications from the computer from the systems interface to a separate network address [Figures <1,5> | column 9 <lines 20-37> | column 13 <lines 39-40> where: the TCP/IP in the message format references a network address for the intranet].

Devine does not explicitly disclose sending a message to the computer, the message causing the computer to launch a software application that seeks out a separate network address on the intranet.

44> Stone discloses sending a message to the computer, the message causing the computer to launch a software application that seeks out a separate network address on the intranet [column 1 <lines 8-11> | column 2 <lines 35-39> | column 3 <lines 1-9> | column 8 <lines 49-59> | column 12 <lines 60-65>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 2152

implement messaging functionality from Devine's system interface as taught by Stone to allow Devine's system interface to automatically navigate the user to a proper address on the intranet without any needed action from the user.

45> As to claim 24, Devine discloses the method of claim 23, wherein the systems interface comprises a first server having a first network address and a second server having a second network address, wherein the first server is for providing a protocol interface between the computer and the second server, and wherein the second server is for processing requests and generating legacy transactions [Figures <1, 5> | column 22 <lines 8-22 and 47-65> | column 23 <lines 7-19> | column 24 <lines 1-25> where: Devine's web server is comparable to the first server, and Devine's Internet Dispatcher server is comparable to the second server. Although Devine does not specifically teach that the servers have separate addresses, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably inferred that the servers would have distinct addresses to insure communications within the network].

46> As to claim 25, Devine discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the step of directing comprises directing communications from the first network address to the separate network address [Figure 5 <items 10,15,32, 52,65,66,26,40,20> | column 22 <lines 8-19> where: the browser is directed from the web server (or router) to a router located on the MCI intranet and then directed onward to the legacy systems intranet. Although Devine does not specifically disclose that the communications are directed from one address to a separate network address, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably inferred that the web server,

Art Unit: 2152

the dispatcher server and the Legacy systems intranet would have their own separate network addresses to properly be addressed by the browser].

47> As to claim 26, Devine discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the request is based on user selection of an icon or software button [column 7 <lines 64-67>].

48> As to claim 27, Devine discloses the method of claim 24, wherein the software application is a browser [Figure 1 <item 14>], but does not explicitly disclose that the message comprises an application program interface command.

49> Stone discloses a message comprising an application program interface command [column 2 <lines 35-40> | column 9 <lines 51-58>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Stone's application program interface command functionality into Devine for the purposes of allowing a server application to initiate a browser instance using standard Windows API commands to insure application compatibility with the ubiquitous Windows OS.

50> As to claim 28, Devine discloses a system for permitting a user to access data by employing a computer to access information from legacy systems, wherein the computer is running application-specific client software to access the information from legacy systems and wherein the application-specific client software displays a first window with a software button that can be engaged to initiate a request for access to an intranet [abstract | Figure 3 |

Art Unit: 2152

| column 1 <lines 21-24> | column 6 <lines 39-62> | column 7 <lines 35-67> | column 8 <lines 25-30>], the system comprising:

a systems interface to the legacy systems, the systems interface including a protocol server and a transaction server, the protocol server having a first network address and the transaction server having a second network address [Figures <1, 5> | column 22 <lines 8-22 and 47-65> | column 23 <lines 7-19> | column 24 <lines 1-25> where: Devine's web server is comparable to the first server, and Devine's Internet Dispatcher server is comparable to the second server];

Devine does disclose launching a browser application, but does not specifically disclose the transaction server issuing at least one message in response to the request, the at least one message causing the computer to launch a browser application as a second window, and the at least one message causing communications from the computer to be directed from the first network address to a third network address corresponding to the intranet.

51> Stone discloses issuing at least one message in response to the request, the at least one message causing the computer to launch a browser application as a second window, and the at least one message causing communications from the computer to be directed from the first network address to a third network address corresponding to the intranet [column 1 <lines 8-11> | column 2 <lines 35-39> | column 3 <lines 1-9> | column 8 <lines 49-59> | column 12 <lines 60-65> where: the server application provides the functionality comparable to the functionality of the transaction server]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement messaging functionality from Devine's system interface as taught by Stone to

allow Devine's system interface to automatically navigate the user to a proper address on the intranet without any needed action from the user.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dung C. Dinh', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner